

REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The abstract has been amended as to form.

The Official Action noted a spelling error as to one term. Responsively, the specification and claims have been amended to correct the spelling error.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected as anticipated by HENSHAW 6,040,833. Claim 6 stands rejected as obvious over HENSHAW in view of PORTER, and further in view of TAYLOR 6,118,461.

The remaining claims 3-5 and 7-10 stand rejected as obvious over HENSHAW in view of PORTER 6,570,595.

The claims have been amended so as to patentably recite the invention.

See that the claims now recite a third element "applying display effect to said un-overlapping region of said first screen region without applying said display effect to said overlapping region of said first screen region." Support for this recitation can be found at least on specification page 13, lines 6-13; page 15, lines 13-15; and page 15, lines 22 through line 2 of page 16. As the amended claims recite, there is a first element that detects first and second screen regions on a screen. The first screen region is recited as including overlapping and un-overlapping regions. The overlapping region

of the first screen region is recited as overlapping the second screen region, whereas the un-overlapping region of the first screen region is recited as not overlapping the second screen region.

The amended claims recite a second element which determines whether the overlapping region of the first screen region is hidden behind the second screen region.

As mentioned above, the claims now recite a third element applying display effect only to the un-overlapping region of the first screen region, that is without applying the display effect to the overlapping region of the first screen region.

The present invention teaches an approach where the third element acts to apply the display effect upon the second element determining that the overlapping region of the first region is hidden behind the overlapping region of the second region. As described in the Preferred Embodiment, this feature may be implemented as Display Effector 107, which applies display effect only to an un-overlapping screen region on which a moving picture is actually displayed. Advantageously, as taught by specification, page 21, lines 20-22, this feature enables the user to enjoy recognizable moving picture whether another window overlaps or not.

As to the applied art, neither reference teaches nor suggests the features of the amended claims, in particular the recited third element acting as described.

HENSHAW discloses a depth control window which enables users to "dive" to a selected depth within an overlapping stack of windows and to eliminate from the display those windows which are "above" the selected window. This is done without rearranging the hierarchical order of the windows. This having been said, HENSHAW fails to teach the recitations of the amended claim, again in particular, the recited third element and the corresponding step in the method claim.

PORTER discloses a display device with a display surface which is reserved for an exclusive use by a program in order to allow contents rendered by the program to be persistently visible. However, PORTER neither teaches nor suggests the recited third element of the presently presented claims.

Finally, TAYLOR discloses that multiple overlapping windows represent graphics data, video data (including full motion video data) or icons. See column 5, lines 54-58. In particular, TAYLOR was offered for disclosing the recitation of displaying a moving picture. That having been said, TAYLOR does not teach the recitation of the recited third element.

In summary, none of the applied references teach applying display effect only to an un-overlapping region of a display component when its overlapping region is hidden behind another screen region. Therefore, the presently pending claims are believed to be non-obvious.

The presently pending claims having been amended to patentably recite the present invention, and the application, specification and claims having been amended to address known formal matters, applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Roland E. Long, Jr. Reg. No. 41,949  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

REL/mjr  
June 14, 2004